

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 11 is objected to because of minor informalities.

Claims 5-7 and 10-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,243,142 to Ishikawa et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,903 to Nakatani et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,439 to Kambe et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 5-6 to differently define the invention and amended claim 11 to improve its form. Accordingly, claims 5-7 and 10-17 remain pending in this application for further consideration.

Objection to Claim 11

Claim 11 is objected to because of minor informalities. Applicants have amended claim 11 by replacing “hologenated” with “halogenated” in accordance with the Examiner’s comments set forth in Section 1 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the objection to claim 11 be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7 and 10-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Nakatani et al. and further in view of Kambe et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With regard to independent claim 5, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishikawa et al., Nakatani et al. and Kambe et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least the recited feature of “a conductor layer plated on an exposed surface of the solvent-free insulative filling material.”

For example, as shown in FIG. 2(d) of Nakatani et al., a circuit pattern 106 is formed on an exposed surface of a conductive resin compound 104 (of FIG. 2(a)). However, the circuit pattern 106 and the conductive resin compound 104 are both made of conductive materials. Thus, such a structure of Nakatani et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “a conductor layer plated on an exposed surface of the solvent-free insulative filling material,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5 of the present application. Moreover, Nakatani et al. is directed to connecting member for connecting circuits as shown in FIG. 5(a), which is completely silent about forming an insulating layer on the conducting resin compound 104.

Ishikawa et al. relates to a single layer wiring board, not a multi-layer printed wiring board. Applicants respectfully submit that Ishikawa et al. fails to teach or suggest a feature of “an insulating layer formed on a surface of the conductor layer,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5. Moreover, Ishikawa et al. also fails to teach or suggest a feature of “the solvent-free insulative filling material includes . . . a dicyandiamide curing agent,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5.

Kambe et al., as shown in FIG. 3G for example, discloses that an epoxy resin is filled in vias 55 and 56 and blind vias 57 and 58, as set forth in col. 11, lines 21 to 23. However, Applicants respectfully submit that such a disclosure fails to teach or suggest that a dicyandiamide curing agent is used for the epoxy resin. Moreover, the drawings of Kambe et al.

also fails to show a structure wherein a conductor layer is plated on the exposed surface of the solvent-free insulative filling material, which characterizes the present application. In other words, Kambe et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “a conductor layer plated on an exposed surface of the solvent-free insulative filling material,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5 of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishikawa et al., Nakatani et al. and Kambe et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least the recited feature of “a conductor layer plated on an exposed surface of the solvent-free insulative filling material,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5 of the present application.

For at least the reasons as those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Final Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to newly-amended independent claim 5, and hence its dependent claims 6-7 and 10-17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Without other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-7 and 10-17 in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP

By:

Xiaobin You
Reg. No. L0112

Dated: June 23, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tel 202.739.3000
Fax 202.739.3001